

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 through 12 remain in this application. Claims 13 through 24 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer in order to expedite allowance of the remaining claims.

Claims 1 through 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. US 7,058,409 B2 to Hänninen, et al. ("Hänninen, et al. patent") in view of U.S. Patent No. US 6,993,354 B2 to Momosaki, et al. ("Momosaki, et al. patent").

Claim 1 as amended provides, *inter alia*, coordinating collection of data by the wireless communication device with one or more remote devices "by associating the collected data with the incident". The above Office Action, at page 8, line 16, indicates that the above language is disclosed at col. 4, line 65, through col. 5, line 3, of the Hänninen, et al. patent.

The Hänninen, et al. patent does not describe or suggest coordinating data collection by associating collected data with an incident. The Hänninen, et al. patent, particularly col. 4, line 65, through col. 5, line 3, describes collecting and forwarding data relating to the events occurring during the crime, but does not describe any effort by the mobile terminal to ensure that the collected data is associated with an incident. In fact, there is no indication by the Hänninen, et al. patent that the mobile terminal may receive multiple feeds, or any other purpose necessitating coordination or association of collected data. Col. 4, line 65, through col. 5, line 3, of the Hänninen, et al. patent is able to forego any coordination/association effort because the statement is made in reference to FIG. 2, which shows only one device in the hand of a single victim, thus there is only a single source of data.

It is important to note that, even in view of FIG. 1, the Hanninen, et al. patent does not describe or suggest multiple sources of data collected by the mobile terminal or any other reason for coordinating/associating collected data. FIG. 1 shows a digital camera 110 communicating with a mobile terminal 120, but the Hanninen, et al. patent does not describe more than one source of collected data. In fact, col. 2, lines 56 through 58, states that the digital camera 110 may be either external to the mobile terminal 120 or integrated within the mobile terminal to generate image data, thus suggesting that the digital camera is the sole source of collected data in either case. No where in the Hanninen, et al. patent is there described data collected from an external digital camera together with data collected from the mobile terminal. Accordingly, the Hanninen, et al. patent does not describe or suggest coordinating the collection of data by associating the collected data with the incident, because the Hanninen, et al. patent does not even recognize the problem of collecting data by a mobile terminal from multiple sources.

Likewise, the Momosaki, et al. patent does not describe or suggest any type of coordination of data collection between devices. Therefore, claim 1 distinguishes patentably from the Hanninen, et al. patent, the Momosaki, et al. patent, and the suggested combination of these references.

Claims 2 through 6 depend from and include all limitations of independent claim 1. Therefore, claims 2 through 6 distinguish patentably from the Hanninen, et al. patent, the Momosaki, et al. patent, and the suggested combination of these references for the reasons stated above for claim 1.

Claim 7 as amended provides, *inter alia*, recording data relating to the subject matter of the incident event in response to detecting the request signal or receiving the information about the designated location from the remote device. The above Office Action, at page 11, line 10 through 13, indicates that the above language is disclosed at col. 5, lines 12 through 18, of the Hanninen, et al. patent.

The Hanninen, et al. patent and the Momosaki, et al. patent do not describe or suggest a device that records incident data in response to receiving a signal or information from a remote device. Claim 7 specifies that recording occurs in response to detecting a request signal from a remote device or receiving information from the remote device. Col. 5, lines 12 through 18, of the Hanninen, et al. patent describes recording in response to a key or voice activation, based on location information, or by a predetermined authority. The Hanninen, et al. patent does not describe or suggest recording in response to receiving a signal or information from a remote device, as required by claim 7. Likewise, the Momosaki, et al. patent does not describe or suggest any type of data recordation in response to a signal or information received from a remote device. Therefore, claim 7 distinguishes patentably from the Hanninen, et al. patent, the Momosaki, et al. patent, and the suggested combination of these references.

Claims 8 through 12 depend from and include all limitations of independent claim 7. Therefore, claims 8 through 12 distinguish patentably from the Hanninen, et al. patent, the Momosaki, et al. patent, and the suggested combination of these references for the reasons stated above for claim 7.

In view of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 1 through 12 are respectfully requested.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. Also, no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicants have argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to deduct any additional fees arising as a result of this response, including any fees for Extensions of Time, or any other communication from or to credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-2117.

It is submitted that the claims clearly define the invention, are supported by the specification and drawings, and are in a condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Should the Examiner have any questions or concerns that may expedite prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
Brown, Daniel P., et al.

Please forward all correspondence to:
Motorola, Inc.
Law Department (HDW)
600 North US Highway 45
Libertyville, IL 60048

<u>/HISASHI D. WATANABE/</u>	<u>02/16/07</u>
Hisashi D. Watanabe	Date
Attorney for Applicant(s)	
Registration No. 37,465	
Telephone: (847) 523-2322	
Facsimile: (847) 523-2350	